This report is filed pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-57-110, which requires the filing of quarterly reports. This quarterly report provides information for the period July 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012. The information contained in this report is accurate as of October 12, 2012. All of IPRA’s public reports are available at www.iprachicago.org.

Quarterly Overview

During the 3rd quarter of 2012, IPRA initiated 690 investigations. This includes 204 investigations related to a notification of a Taser discharge. The number of officer involved shootings increased to 19 – up from the previous quarter.

Between July and September, IPRA closed 698 investigations. The number reflects a decrease from last quarter. IPRA continues to have investigative vacancies; however, the three investigators that were hired in early July have completed training and have recently been assigned cases.

This past quarter IPRA completed 35 sustained investigations. This was a fifty-two percent increase from the previous quarter. There has been a concerted effort to increase the number of cases closed through the mediation process. There were 18 cases this past quarter identified where mediation was deemed appropriate and 16 officers agreed to accept. These officers have accepted responsibility for their actions and hopefully similar behavior that warranted the complaint will not happen again in the future.

At the beginning of July, IPRA was able to fill its vacant Director of Public Affairs position. In this next quarter, IPRA will resume hosting community meetings. IPRA also attended the three monthly Police Board Meetings.
### IPRA Cumulative Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Intake (all allegations/notifications)</th>
<th>IPRA Investigations Opened</th>
<th>IPRA Investigations Closed</th>
<th>IPRA Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2007</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q 2007</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q 2008</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2008</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q 2008</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q 2008</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q 2009</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2009</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q 2009</td>
<td>2807</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q 2009</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q 2010</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2010</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q 2010</td>
<td>2591</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q 2010</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>2233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q 2011</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2011</td>
<td>2171</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>2159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q 2011</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q 2011</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>2237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q 2012</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>2210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q 2012</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q 2012</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Pursuant to the IPRA Ordinance, certain events trigger an IPRA investigation even in the absence of an allegation of misconduct. The term “notification” refers to those events that IPRA investigates where there is no alleged misconduct.

2. This number includes investigations opened and assigned to IPRA as of the end of the identified quarter. It does not include investigations “Re-opened” because of the settlement of litigation, new evidence, or the results of the Command Channel Review process.

3. This number may include some investigations “Re-closed” after being Re-opened.

4. The caseload number for periods prior to 3Q 2009 are the numbers that IPRA previously reported in quarterly reports. As discussed previously, due to a calculation error, over time these numbers became inaccurate. The caseload number for 3Q 2009 reflects the results of IPRA’s complete audit of pending investigations.

5. The number of investigations closed and IPRA Caseload reflect a correction of numbers reported in a previous report.
# IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPRA (COMPLAINTS)</th>
<th>EXTRAORDINARY OCCURRENCE (EO)</th>
<th>HIT SHOOTING (U#)</th>
<th>NON-HIT SHOOTING</th>
<th>SHOOTING/ANIMAL</th>
<th>TASER</th>
<th>OC DISCHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFO &amp; CR</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2007</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Q 2008</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Q 2008</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Q 2008</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2008</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Q 2009</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Q 2009</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Q 2009</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2009</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Q 2010</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Q 2010</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Q 2010</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2010</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Q 2011</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Q 2011</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Q 2011</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2011</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Q 2012</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Q 2012</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3Q 2012</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-57-110(1): The number of investigations initiated since the last report

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA issued 2264 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 690 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1574 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

---

6 Note: A single investigation may fall into more than one Incident Type. For instance, an investigation may be both an Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) and a Complaint Register (CR). For this chart, the investigation is counted in all applicable Incident Types. They are counted only once, in the total Log Numbers retained by IPRA. As defined by ordinance, an Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) is a death or injury to a person while in police custody or other extraordinary or unusual occurrence in a lockup facility.
Of the 690 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 181 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 230 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 19 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 14 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 28 for shots fired at animals, 204 for reported uses of tasers, 5 for reported uses of pepper spray, and 12 for Extraordinary Occurrences.

2-57-110(2): The number of investigations concluded since the last report

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA closed 698 Log Numbers. A Log Number is considered closed when IPRA completes its work on the matter, regardless of whether the Police Department is still processing the results.

2-57-110(3): The number of investigations pending as of the report date

As of September 30, 2012, there were 2147 investigations pending completion by IPRA. These include both allegations that have received Complaint Register Numbers, and those being followed under a Log Number, as well as officer-involved shootings, and Extraordinary Occurrences.

2-57-110(4): The number of complaints not sustained since the last report

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA recommended that 173 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 202 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 49 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 4 be closed as “exonerated.”

2-57-110(5): The number of complaints sustained since the last report

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA recommended that 35 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.

---

7 As of December 31, 2007, IPRA issued a Log Number for notifications of uses of taser, pepper spray, or for shootings where no one is injured only if it received a telephonic notification of the incident or there was an allegation of misconduct. As of January 1, 2008, IPRA implemented procedures to issue Log Numbers for all uses of taser and shootings, regardless of the method of notification. In addition CPD issued a reminder to CPD personnel to provide notification to IPRA. IPRA continues to issue Log Numbers for discharges of pepper spray at the request of CPD personnel.

8 These numbers include one Log Number classified as both a U Number and a Complaint Register; and two Log Numbers classified as both an Extraordinary Occurrence and a Complaint Register. These Log Numbers are counted only once in the total number of Log Numbers retained by IPRA, but included in the breakouts of all applicable incident types.

9 The term “not sustained” is a term of art in police misconduct investigations. It is defined in CPD G.O. 93-3 as “when there is insufficient evidence either to prove or disprove allegation.” In addition, cases may be “unfounded,” which means “the allegation is false or not factual.”
2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report\(^\text{11}\)

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

- District 01 = 86
- District 02 = 81
- District 03 = 140
- District 04 = 121
- District 05 = 93
- District 06 = 127
- District 07 = 104
- District 08 = 123
- District 09 = 102
- District 10 = 77
- District 11 = 118
- District 12 = 46
- District 13 = 31
- District 14 = 61
- District 15 = 69
- District 16 = 64
- District 17 = 33
- District 18 = 87
- Outside City Limits = 38
- Unknown location = 27

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report\(^\text{12}\)

(See Attachment)

2-57-110(8): The number of complaints referred to other agencies and the identity of such other agencies

Between July 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012, IPRA referred 1587 cases to other agencies as follows:

- Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1574
- Cook County State’s Attorney = 13

\(^{10}\) Abstracts for all investigations where IPRA has recommended a sustained finding can be found at www.iprachicago.org under the Resources heading.

\(^{11}\) "Complaints" is defined as all reports of alleged misconduct, whether from the community or from a source internal to the Police Department, whether a Complaint Register number has been issued or not. This does not include, absent an allegation of misconduct, reports of uses of Tasers, pepper spray, discharges of weapons whether hitting an individual or not, or Extraordinary Occurrences. Districts are identified based on the district where the alleged misconduct occurred. Some complaints occurred in more than one District, they are counted in each district where they occurred. This list does include confidential complaints.

\(^{12}\) This uses the same definition of “complaints” as the preceding section. Except as otherwise noted, if a member was assigned to one unit but detailed to another at the time of the complaint, the member is listed under the detailed unit.
**ATTACHMENT: COMPLAINTS AGAINST CPD MEMBERS BY UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 001</th>
<th>District 012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-11: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-9: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 12-13: 2 complaints each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 002</th>
<th>District 013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-20: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-8: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members 21-23: 2 complaints each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 003</th>
<th>District 014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-18: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-22: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members 19-21: 2 complaints each</td>
<td>Member 23: 2 complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member 24: 3 complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 004</th>
<th>District 015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-32: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-17: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members 33-37: 2 complaints each</td>
<td>Members 19-20: 2 complaints each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 005</th>
<th>District 016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-17: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-7: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members 18-19: 2 complaints each</td>
<td>Member 8: 2 complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 006</th>
<th>District 017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-32: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-8: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 33: 2 complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 007</th>
<th>District 018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-24: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-23: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members 25-27: 2 complaints</td>
<td>Member 24-26: 2 complaints each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 008</th>
<th>District 019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-16: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-22: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 17: 2 complaints</td>
<td>Member 23: 2 complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 009</th>
<th>District 020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-20: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-10: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member 11: 2 complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 010</th>
<th>District 022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-20: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-23: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member 24-26: 2 complaints each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 011</th>
<th>District 024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members 1-36: 1 complaint each</td>
<td>Members 1-22: 1 complaint each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 37: 5 complaints</td>
<td>Members 23-24: 2 complaints each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District 025
Members 1-26: 1 complaint each
Member 27-28: 2 complaints each

Recruit Training (044)¹
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each
Member 3: 2 complaints

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)
Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Marine Unit (059)
Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Special Investigations Unit (079)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Deployment Operations Center (116)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint

Education and Training Division (124)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

CAPS Division (135)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Special Functions Division (141)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Traffic Section (145)
Members 1-5: 1 complaint each
Member 6: 2 complaints

Records Inquiry Section (163)
 Member 1: 1 complaint

Field Services Section (166)
Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Forensic Services Division (177)
Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Narcotics Section (189)
Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Asset Forfeiture Division (192)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Gang Investigation Division (193)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Asset Forfeiture Investigations Section (196)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)
Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)
Members 1-6: 1 complaint each
Member 7: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)
Members 1-9: 1 complaint each
Member 10: 1 complaint

Timekeeping Unit – Headquarters (222)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)
Members 1-5: 1 complaint each
Member 6: 3 complaints

Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)
Members 1-9: 1 complaint each
Member 10: 1 complaint

¹ These numbers include CPD members who are detailed to a District as part of their training, but are officially still assigned to Recruit Training.
Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Team – Area 4 (Former 314)
Member 1-3: 1 complaint each

Gang Team – Area 5 (Former 315)
Members 1-18: 1 complaint each
Member 19-20: 1 complaint each

Alternate Response Section (376)
Members 1-7: 1 complaint each
Member 8: 2 complaints

Crime Scene Processing Unit – ET North (377)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Juvenile Intervention Support Center (384)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Enforcement Division (393)
Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Crime Scene Processing Unit – ET South (477)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Detached Services – Government Security Detail (542)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Detached Services-Miscellaneous Detail (543)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Bomb and Arson Division (603)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Central Investigations Unit (606)
Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Major Accident Investigation Unit (608)
Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)
Members 1-4: 1 complaint each
Member 5: 2 complaints

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)
Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)
Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Public Transportation Section (701)
Members 1-7: 1 complaint each
Member 8: 2 complaints

Transit Security Unit (704)
Members 1-2: 1 complaint each
Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1008540
On August 18, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 18, 2007 in the 23rd District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A, B, and C). It was alleged that Officer A pulled the victim’s hood over his head and punched him on his face and neck; verbally abused the victim; and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Officers B and C observed misconduct and failed to take action and both individually provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainant, and witnesses, department reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A pulled the victim’s hood over his head and punched him on his face and neck; verbally abused the victim; and both individually provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainant, and witnesses, department reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Officers B and C observed misconduct and failed to take action and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a forty-five (45) day suspension for Officer A and a thirty (30) day suspension for Officers B and C.

Log/C.R. No. 1008640
On August 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 22, 2007 in the 14th District involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Lieutenant (Lieutenant A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers B and C). It was alleged that Lieutenant A improperly executed a search warrant and verbally abused the complainant. It was alleged that Officers B and C discharged their weapons and destroyed complainant’s dogs without justification. Based on statements from the accused members, complainant and witnesses, photographs and department reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Lieutenant A improperly executed a search warrant. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Lieutenant A verbally abused the complainant. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, photographs and department reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that Officers B and C discharged their weapons and destroyed complainant’s dogs without justification.
Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2012

IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for the accused Lieutenant.**

*Log/C.R. No. 1009860*

On October 4, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 4, 2007 in the 9th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused Complainants A, B, and C; grabbed Complainant A and pushed him against a car; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. It was alleged that Officer B observed misconduct and failed to take action; verbally abused Complainant A; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officers, complainants, and department reports, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer A verbally abused Complainants A, B, and C; grabbed Complainant A and pushed him against a car; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer B observed misconduct and failed to take action; verbally abused Complainant A; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a **twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A** and a **fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer B.**

*Log/C.R. No. 1022800*

On January 1, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 1, 2009 in the 25th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer bit Victim Sergeant on the leg; kicked Victim Officer A on the leg; kicked Victim Paramedic A on the arm; spat on the back of the head of Victim Paramedic B; verbally abused Victim Sergeant; verbally abused Victim Officer B; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer bit Victim Sergeant on the leg; kicked Victim Officer A on the leg; kicked Victim Paramedic A on the arm; spat on the back of the head of Victim Paramedic B; verbally abused Victim Sergeant; verbally abused Victim Officer B; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused Officer.**
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Log/C.R. No. 1031216
On October 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 8th and 22nd Districts, on various dates, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that on October 22, 2009, that the accused Officer threatened complainant via telephone. It was further alleged that from August 5, 2009 through October 2009, that the accused Officer harassed complainant via several phone calls. It was later alleged that on an undetermined date and time on or about April and/or May 2009, the accused Officer put a pillow over her infant daughter’s face and shook her infant daughter on two separate occasions. It was alleged that on December 2, 2009, that the accused Officer made a false report to the Department. It was alleged that on December 15, 2009, that the accused Officer provided false information in a Petition for Order of Protection. It was further alleged that on June 17, 2010, that the accused Officer made a false report to IPRA. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant, and witnesses, DCFS and police reports, OEMC, telephone, medical and court records, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on October 22, 2009, the accused Officer threatened complainant via telephone. Further, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on August 5, 2009 through October 2009, the accused Officer harassed complainant via several phone calls. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on December 15, 2009, the accused Officer provided false information in a Petition for Order of Protection. Further, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that on June 17, 2010, the accused Officer made a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that on an undetermined date and time on or about April and/or May 2009, the accused Officer put a pillow over her infant daughter’s face and shook her infant daughter on two separate occasions. IPRA recommended separation for the accused Officer from the department.

Log/C.R. No. 1031396
On October 29, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 29, 2009 in the 16th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was intoxicated while off duty, made a false statement to a superior officer, engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the department, failed to follow procedure after the discharge of his firearm in that the officer did not make the appropriate oral and
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written reports after he discharged his firearm, disobeyed a department directive regarding firearm discharge, unlawfully and unnecessarily used his firearm, and subsequently pled guilty to the charges of Reckless Conduct and Discharge of Firearm in City Limits. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a thirty (30) day suspension.

Log/C.R. No. 1044943
On April 24, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 24, 2011 in the 8th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1045412
On May 14, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 14, 2011 in the 5th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1049571
On October 25, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2011 in the 22nd District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant failed to properly secure his weapon and verbally threatened Complainants A and B. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Reprimand”.

Log/C.R. No. 1049626
On October 27, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 27, 2011 in the 3rd District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer
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agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1050191
On November 21, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 21, 2011 in the 16th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1050398
On December 1, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred on December 1, 2011 and December 4, 2011 in the 19th District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. On December 1, 2011, it was alleged that the accused Sergeant threatened the complainant (his brother) via text message, threatened the complainant via voicemail, verbally abused the complainant via voicemail, and was intoxicated. On December 4, 2011, it was alleged that the accused Sergeant threatened complainant via text message. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1052479
On March 10, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 10, 2012 in the 5th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.
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Log/C.R. No. 1047471
On August 5, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 5, 2011 in Lake Delton, Wisconsin. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer was intoxicated; was in possession of her weapon while intoxicated; was inattentive to duty, in that she failed to maintain control of her weapon; threatened to shoot her fiancé, the victim; pointed her weapon at the victim; engaged in a physical altercation with the victim; discharged her weapon; was arrested for Felony Endangering Safety, Disorderly Conduct, and Endanger Safety/Use/Dangerous Weapon; failed to report her felony arrest; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a forty-five (45) day suspension.

Log/C.R. No. 1045406
On May 13, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents that occurred in the spring of 2011 continuing through May 2011 in the 16th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant violated an Order of Protection in that he contacted his five children, Complainants A through E, multiple times via telephone and text messaging on May 13, 2011; telephoned son Complainant A multiple times on May 20, 2011; contacted his wife, Complainant F, on May 20, 2011 via email and accessed her email account on May 23, 2011; harassed his wife, Complainant F, by stealing her car on May 12, 2011; threatened his wife, Complainant F, in Spring 2011; harassed his wife, Complainant F, through electronic means in April and May 2011; and struck his sons, Complainant B and C, on unknown dates. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a three (3) day suspension.

Log/C.R. No. 1048130
On September 1, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 1, 2011 in the 3rd District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.
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Log/C.R. No. 1033096
On January 12, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 12, 2010 in the 22\textsuperscript{nd} District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer (CPD) was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to secure his weapon; shot Victim A; assaulted Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; verbally abused Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; brought discredit to on the department, in that he interfered with the Chicago Fire Department (CFD) personnel who were attempting to treat Victim A and was subsequently arrested for those actions; and provided false statements to investigating police officers and detectives regarding this incident when he indicated that Victim A shot himself. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical, expert, breathalyzer, and police reports, OEMC records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer was intoxicated while off-duty; failed to secure his weapon; assaulted Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; verbally abused Victim B, a CPD Sergeant; and brought discredit to on the department, in that he interfered with the Chicago Fire Department personnel who were attempting to treat Victim A and was subsequently arrested for those actions. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer shot Victim A and provided false statements to investigating police officers and detectives regarding this incident when he indicated that Victim A shot himself. IPRA recommended a sixty (60) day suspension for the accused Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1046872
On July 12, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 12, 2011 in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Reprimand".

Log/C.R. No. 314738
On August 6, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on August 6, 2006 in the 18\textsuperscript{th} District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department Officer (CPD) punched victim about his face; detained victim without justification; threatened to kill victim; directed a racial
slur at the victim; failed to properly restrain the victim; left his duty assignment without proper authorization; failed to adequately secure department property; failed to promptly report damage to department property; made a false report regarding his contact with the victim; make a false report regarding damage to department property; made a false report regarding his activities; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical and police reports, OEMC records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused Officer punched victim about his face; detained victim without justification; threatened to kill victim; directed a racial slur at the victim; failed to properly restrain the victim; left his duty assignment without proper authorization; failed to adequately secure department property; failed to promptly report damage to department property; made a false report regarding his contact with the victim; make a false report regarding damage to department property; made a false report regarding his activities; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended separation for the accused Officer from the department.

Log/C.R. No. 1044261
On March 25, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 25, 2011 in the 10th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Log/C.R. No. 1023942
On February 17, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 13, 2011 in the 18th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer verbally abused complainant; grabbed complainant by the collar and pushed him down onto a Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) bus seat; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused officer, victim and witnesses, medical and police reports, CTA and OEMC records, and video, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused Officer verbally abused complainant. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED”
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for the allegation that the accused Officer grabbed complainant by the collar and pushed him down onto a CTA bus seat. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused Officer failed to complete a TRR documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1029189**
On August 14, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 3, 2009 in the 19th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer verbally abused the victim; choked the victim; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. Based on statements from the accused Officer, victim and witnesses, police reports and medical records, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the accused Officer verbally abused the victim and choked the victim. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused Officer failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) documenting his use of force during the arrest of the complainant. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the accused Officer.

**Log/C.R. No. 1044788**
On April 17, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 17, 2011 in the 12th District, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

**Log/C.R. No. 1049273**
On October 13, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 13, 2011 in the 14th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” and a “Violation Noted”.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

AUGUST 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1052698
On March 17, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 17, 2012 in the 19th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer failed to properly document his encounter with an unknown subject. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Violation Noted".

Log/C.R. No. 1029960
On September 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 9, 2009 in the 8th District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" and a "Written Reprimand".

Log/C.R. No. 1017706
On June 26, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on June 26, 2008 in the 14th District, involving five on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through E). It was alleged that accused Officers B and C failed to place Victim where he could be monitored and supervised. It was also alleged that Officers A, D, and E failed to process Victim in a timely manner and failed to properly monitor Victim. Based on statements from the accused and witnesses, medical records, photographs and video, and police records, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer A violated departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to place Victim A where he could be monitored and supervised. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer C failed to follow guidelines for arrestee screening in that he failed to place Victim where he could be monitored. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer D failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer D violated Departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN"
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the allegation that Officer E failed to process Victim A in a timely manner. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that Officer E violated Departmental policy regarding monitoring arrestees held in lockup facilities. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for Officer B, a one (1) day suspension for Officer D, and a one (1) day suspension for Officer E.

Log/C.R. No. 1032601
On December 17, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on December 16, 2009 in the 7th District, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that accused Officer A stomped/kicked the Victim; verbally abused the Victim; struck the Victim on the face; submitted false department reports regarding the arrest of the Victim; and provided a false statement to IPRA on March 8, 2010, and September 13, 2011. It was also alleged that accused Officer B held the Victim to the ground by placing his foot on his back; submitted false department reports regarding the arrest of the Victim; witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; and provided false statements to IPRA on April 27, 2010, June 4, 2010, and September 15, 2011. Based on statements from the complainant and witnesses, medical records, photographs and video, 911 calls, and police records, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer A stomped/kicked the Victim; verbally abused the Victim; struck the Victim on the face; made false department reports regarding the Victim’s arrest; and provided a false report to IPRA on April 8, 2010. Further, IPRA also recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that Officer B physically maltreated the Victim by placed his foot on the Victim’s back; made false reports relative to the Victim’s arrest; witnessed and failed to report misconduct; and provided false statements to IPRA on April 27, 2010, June 4, 2010, and September 15, 2011. IPRA recommended separation for both Officers A and B.

Log/C.R. No. 1014602
On March 2, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 2, 2008 in Forest Park, Illinois. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer directed profanities at Victim A; caused a disturbance by jumping around and landing on his back on restaurant tables, causing them to break; was arrested, charged, and subsequently indicted for the criminal offenses of Aggravated Battery and Resisting or Obstructing a Peace Officer; was intoxicated while off-
duty; failed to identify himself as a CPD Officer; struck Victim B, a Forest Park Police Officer, on the face; grabbed Victim C, a Forest Park Police Sergeant by his legs and tackled him to the ground; spat on Victim D, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic; and directed profanities at Victim E, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic. Based on statements from the accused Officer, victims and witnesses, medical and ambulance reports, photographs, radio transmissions, CPD, Forest Park Police, and Cook County Sheriff’s Department records, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the accused Officer failed to identify himself as a CPD Officer. Further, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused Officer directed profanities at Victim A; caused a disturbance by jumping around and landing on his back on restaurant tables, causing them to break; was arrested, charged, and subsequently indicted for the criminal offenses of Aggravated Battery and Resisting or Obstructing a Peace Officer; was intoxicated while off-duty; struck Victim B, a Forest Park Police Officer, on the face; grabbed Victim C, a Forest Park Police Sergeant by his legs and tackled him to the ground; spat on Victim D, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic; and directed profanities at Victim E, a Forest Park Fire Department Paramedic. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused Officer.
Abstracts of Sustained Cases

SEPTEMBER 2012

Log/C.R. No. 1031207
On October 22, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 21, 2009, involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer, Officer A, slapped Victim CPD Officer B across the face in the women’s locker room and head-butted her. It was alleged that Officer A placed her hand on her weapon and verbally threatened to kill Victim Officer B. It was also alleged that on April 19, 2011, Officer A gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the incident that occurred on October 21, 2009. Based on statements from the accused, the victim and witnesses, police reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A slapped Victim CPD Officer B across the face in the women’s locker room. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A head-butted Victim CPD Officer B. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A placed her hand on her weapon and verbally threatened to kill Victim CPD Officer B. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A gave a false statement to IPRA on April 19, 2011, regarding the incident that occurred on October 21, 2009. IPRA recommended separation for Officer A.

Log/C.R. No. 1029410
On August 21, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on August 21, 2009, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer punched the Victim in the face and verbally abused him. It was also alleged that on January 22, 2010, the Officer gave a false report to IPRA stating that he did not punch the Victim. Based on statements made by the accused, the victim and a witness, arrest reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer punched the Victim in the face. IPRA also recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the Officer submitted a false report to IPRA. IPRA recommended a written reprimand for the accused Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1010477
Between October 26, 2007 and December 17, 2007, three complaints were registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding three separate incidents involving an off-duty Chicago Police
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Department (CPD) Officer and his girlfriend, the Victim. It was alleged that, on October 26, 2007, the Officer pushed the Victim against a wall, choked and scratched her, verbally abused her, threatened her, and physically maltreated her by pouring drinks on her head and taking her purse from her. It was also alleged that, on December 3, 2007, the Officer slapped the Victim on the face, threatened to kill her, and verbally abused her. It was alleged that, on December 17, 2007, the Officer attempted to grab the Victim during a verbal altercation, and verbally abused her. Based on statements made by the accused, the victim and a witness, photographs and case reports, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer pushed the Victim against a wall, and choked and scratched her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer threatened the Victim. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the Officer physically maltreated the Victim by pouring drinks on her head and taking her purse from her, since the Officer admitted to those acts. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the Officer slapped the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer threatened to kill the Victim and verbally abused her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer attempted to grab the Victim during a verbal altercation, and verbally abused her. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Victim. IPRA recommended a suspension of fifteen (15) days for the accused Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1025477
On April 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 12, 2009, involving one known on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer and other unknown CPD Officers. It was alleged that the unknown Officers falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. It was alleged that the known Officer falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. It was also alleged that the known Officer discharged his taser without justification. Because the complainant did not give a sworn affidavit, IPRA recommended a finding of “NO AFFIDAVIT” for the allegations that the accused Officers falsely arrested Victim A, falsely arrested
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Victim B, slammed Victim C against a squad car, and improperly searched Victim C. However, based on statements made by the accused and witnesses, arrest reports, tactical response reports, and communication records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the known Officer discharged his taser accidentally. IPRA recommended a “Violation Noted” for the known Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1032554
On October 25, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2009, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused Officer punched his ex-wife, the Victim, struck her multiple times with a chair, choked her, pushed her to the floor multiple times, pulled her by the hair, and grabbed her arm, threatened to kill the Victim and her son, and failed to notify the Department that he was the respondent to an Order of Protection granted on February 5, 2010. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a suspension of ten (10) days.

Log/C.R. No. 1035288
On April 9, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 8, 2010, involving one known on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer and one unknown CPD Officer. It was alleged that the unknown Officer maced students from a high school without justification. It was alleged that the known Officer failed to register a complaint on behalf of the high school students who stated that they were maced without justification by the unknown CPD Officer. It was also alleged that the known Officer failed to complete any department reports after being notified by the students that they incurred injuries that required medical attention. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the unknown officer maced the students without justification. Based upon a mediation, the known Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “SUSTAINED” for all allegations and a suspension of one (1) day.